

February 16, 1982

LR 216, 219

PRESIDENT: The Clerk said three, I believe. Now four, Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution.

PRESIDENT: All right, if you want to withdraw it before we take up this amendment, it is withdrawn. Thank you. The Chair poses that we still have about five minutes. Let's take up LR 219.

CLERK: Mr. President, the first request I have is from Senator Wesely to add his name as co-introducer to 219.

PRESIDENT: Unanimous consent has been requested by Senator Wesely to have his name added to LR 219. Any objection. If not, so ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, LR 219 offered by Senators Fowler, Lamb and Wesely is found on page 637 of the Journal. (Read.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Lamb, before I recognize you, we would like to recognize some guests we have. First of all we have Congressman Bereuter under the North balcony, our former colleague here in the Legislature. Welcome back to Congressman Bereuter. It is nice to have you back. Also up here in the North balcony we have 8 fourth graders from Douglas Community School in Senator Warner's District with Linda Nelson, their teacher. They can wave to us. They are right up here. Good morning and welcome to your Legislature. The Chair recognizes Senator Lamb on LR 219.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, as you probably know, the resolution deals with the removal of part of the map making capability of the Soil Conservation Service to Fort Worth, Texas. I guess the main reason that I am in opposition to this resolution is because the General Accounting Office has issued a report that says there is no basis for economic advantages to sending this group down to Texas. I will quote the part of a paragraph. It says, "As a result of our review we have concluded that neither the Service's October 19th proposal nor its supporting data provides an adequate basis for judging the merits of the proposed move to Fort Worth." I would hope we would not spend a lot of time on it. I would just point out that this would result in about 65 job opportunities being lost in the State of Nebraska. I would ask that the resolution be adopted.